

REMARKS:

The applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the examining attorney and to further clarify the claims, without adding any new matter; and in so doing addresses all issues raised by the examining attorney in the Office Action.

I. In the Claims

The office action suggested corrections to minor informalities that were noted in claim 1, suggesting the insertion of the word - the - and in claim 2, suggesting the replacement of “in a” with - the adjustment pin -, deleting a “.”, and removing the phrase “ring ... a” and replacing it with - adjustment in from moving in the -.

Applicant has inserted - the - as suggested. Applicant has replaced “in a direction of” with - the adjustment pin in - to add clarity to the claim. Applicant has also removed the phrase “ring ... a” and replacing it with - adjustment in from moving in the - as suggested.

Claims 1-12 were rejected in the office action under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter claimed.

The Office Action noted that in claim 1, at line 5 and 6, was not clear where “at least one guidance groove” was located. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the Twist up adjustment ring as having a wall, and the adjustment groove as being disposed in wall.

The Office Action further noted that in claim 2, line 6, was not understood due to the fact that the support ring has an adjustment groove. Applicant has amended the claim to clarify the Twist Up adjustment ring has the adjustment groove.

The Office Action noted that claims 3-6 recitation was confusing. Applicant has amended claims 3-6 to clarify the claim. Applicant has amended the claim as suggested to further clarify the groove of the Twist Up adjustment ring has a first groove opening and a second groove opening, that the first and second groove openings being on opposing ends of the Twist Up adjustment ring, with the pin-movement section being installed so that it extends diagonally from the first groove opening to the second groove opening of the Twist Up adjustment ring, and that the pin-stopping section is installed in the direction from the end of the second groove opening of the pin-movement section to the circumference perpendicular to the axis line of the Twist Up adjustment ring, or to the direction of the first groove opening. It is believed this correction correctly reflects the relationships of the invention as shown in the drawings.

The Office Action noted claims 7-12 depend from the rejected base claims and were therefore rejected as inheriting the indefiniteness of the base claims. Applicant believes that the amendment of the base claims has resolved the basis for the rejection.

Furthermore, applicant has amended dependent claims 5 through 7 claims in accordance with the amendments suggested, and clarified Twist Up ring as the Twist Up adjustment ring, and the first and second openings and the first and second groove openings, consistent with the base claims, as amended.

IV Conclusion

Applicant has amended claims 1 through 7 to further clarify the invention claimed. Specifically, without adding new matter, applicant has amended the claims to provide the necessary antecedent basis for each of the elements and to clarify the claims which were confusing. Applicant submits that the application as amended should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted this day of , 2006.

Edwin S. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,044